arXiv:1601.05830v1 [math.RA] 21 Jan 2016

The ascending chain condition for principal left or right ideals of skew generalized power series rings

F. Padashnik, A. Moussavi and H. Mousavi

Department of Pure Mathematics, Faculty of Mathematical Sciences,
Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran, P.O. Box: 14115-134.[1]

Abstract

Let R be a ring, $(S, \leq)$ a strictly ordered monoid and $\omega : S \to End(R)$ a monoid homomorphism. In this paper we study the ascending chain conditions on principal left (resp. right) ideals of the skew generalized power series ring $R[[S, \omega]]$. Among other results, it is shown that $R[[S, \omega]]$ is a right archimedean reduced ring if S is an Artinian strictly totally ordered monoid, R is a right archimedean and S-rigid ring which satisfies the ACC on annihilators and ω_s preserves nonunits of R for each $s \in S$. As a consequence we deduce that the power series rings, Laurent series rings, skew power series rings, skew Laurent series rings and generalized power series rings are reduced satisfying the ascending chain condition on principal left (or right) ideals. It is also proved that, the skew Laurent polynomial ring $R[x, x^{-1}; \alpha]$ satisfies $ACCPL(R)$, if R is α-rigid and satisfies $ACCPL(R)$ and the ACC on left(resp. right) annihilators. Examples are provided to illustrate and delimit our results.

Key words: skew generalized power series ring; right archimedean ring; annihilator; Artinian strictly totally ordered monoid; skew Laurent series ring; skew Laurent polynomial ring.? ? ??*subjclass: 16D15; 16D40; 16D70*?

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper all monoids and rings are with identity element that is inherited by submonoids and subrings and preserved under homomorphisms, but neither monoids nor rings are assumed to be commutative.

A commutative ring R is said to satisfy the ascending chain condition for principal ideals ($ACCP$), if there does not exist an infinite strictly ascending chain of principal ideals of R (see, for example, Dumitrescu et al., [5] or Frohn, [8]). The $ACCP$ is also called 1-ACC in Frohn [7]. Clearly every Noetherian ring satisfies $ACCP$. Ribenboim [25] gave a sufficient condition for the ring $R[[S]]$ of generalized power series being Noetherian. Varadarajan [29] studied Noetherian generalized power series rings. Frohn [7], gave an example to show that $ACCP$ does not rise to the power series ring in general. In Dumitrescu et al. ([5], Proposition 1.2) and Anderson et al. ([1], Proposition 1.1) the authors gave a necessary and sufficient condition under which the rings $A + XB[[X]]$ and $A + XB[X]$ satisfy $ACCP$ where $A \subseteq B$ are domains and X is an indeterminate.

[1]Corresponding author. moussavi.a@modares.ac.ir and moussavi.a@gmail.com.
f.padashnik@modares.ac.ir
h.moosavi@modares.ac.ir .

A partially ordered set $(S, \leq)$ is called *Artinian* if every strictly decreasing sequence of elements of S is finite, and $(S, \leq)$ is called *narrow* if every subset of pairwise order-incomparable elements of S is finite. Thus, $(S, \leq)$ is Artinian and narrow if and only if every nonempty subset of S has at least one but only a finite number of minimal elements.

Clearly, the union of a finite family of artinian and narrow subsets of an ordered set as well as any subset of an artinian and narrow set are again artinian and narrow. An *ordered monoid* is a pair $(S, \leq)$ consisting of a monoid S and an order $\leq$ on S such that for all $a, b, c \in S$, $a \leq b$ implies $ca \leq cb$ and $ac \leq bc$. An ordered monoid $(S, \leq)$ is said to be *strictly ordered* if for all $a, b, c \in S$, $a < b$ implies $ca < cb$ and $ac < bc$.

For a strictly ordered monoid S and a ring R, Ribenboim [28] defined the ring of generalized power series $R[[S]]$ consisting of all maps from S to R whose support is Artinian and narrow with the pointwise addition and the convolution multiplication. This construction provided interesting examples of rings (e.g., Elliott and Ribenboim, [6]; Ribenboim, [26],[27]) and it was extensively studied by many authors.

In [22], R. Mazurek and M. Ziembowski, introduced a "twisted" version of the Ribenboim construction and study when it produces a von Neumann regular ring. Now we recall the construction of the skew generalized power series ring introduced in [22]. Let R be a ring, $(S, \leq)$ a strictly ordered monoid, and $\omega : S \to End(R)$ a monoid homomorphism. For $s \in S$, let ω_s denote the image of s under ω, that is $\omega_s = \omega(s)$. Let A be the set of all functions $f : S \to R$ such that the support $\text{supp}(f) = \{s \in S : f(s) \neq 0\}$ is Artinian and narrow. Then for any $s \in S$ and $f, g \in A$ the set

$$X_s(f, g) = \{(x, y) \in \text{supp}(f) \times \text{supp}(g) : s = xy\}$$

is finite. Thus one can define the product $fg : S \to R$ of $f, g \in A$ as follows:

$$fg(s) = \sum_{(u,v) \in X_s(f,g)} f(u)\omega_u(g(v)),$$

(by convention, a sum over the empty set is 0). With pointwise addition and multiplication as defined above, A becomes a ring, called *the ring of skew generalized power series* with coefficients in R and exponents in S (one can think of a map $f : S \to R$ as a formal series $\sum_{s \in S} r_s s$, where $r_s = f(s) \in R$) and denoted either by $R[[S^{\leq}, \omega]]$ or by $R[[S, \omega]]$ (see [20] and [21]). For every $r \in R$ and $s \in S$ we associate the maps $c_r, e_s : S \longrightarrow R$ defined by

$$c_r(x) = \begin{cases} r & ; x = 1 \\ 0 & ; \text{Otherwise} \end{cases} \quad , e_s(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & ; x = s \\ 0 & ; \text{Otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $x \in S$. In fact, $c_r(x)$ and $e_s(x)$ are like r and x^s in $R[x]$ respectively.

A ring R is said to satisfy the ascending chain condition on principal left ideals ($ACCPL$) if there does not exist an infinite strictly ascending chain of principal left ideals of R. Rings satisfying the ascending chain condition on principal right ideals ($ACCPR$) are defined analogously.

Obvious examples of rings satisfying $ACCPL$ are left Noetherian rings. Also every left perfect ring satisfies $ACCPL$, since by a celebrated theorem of Bass (see [3]) the left perfect condition is equivalent to the descending chain condition on principal right ideals, which in turn implies $ACCPL$, by Jonahs theorem from [15]. In the commutative case the ascending chain condition on principal ideals ($ACCP$) appears naturally in studies of factorization in domains (e.g., [1, 5]; see also [4], Section 2]). For commutative rings several authors studied the passage of $ACCP$ to some classical ring constructions such as localizations (e.g. [2, 10, 12]), polynomial rings (e.g. [8, 9, 13]), monoid rings (e.g. [17]) or power series rings (e.g. [7]). In [19] the $ACCP$

condition for commutative generalized power series rings was studied and it was proved that if R is a commutative domain and S is a commutative strictly totally ordered monoid, then the ring $R[[S]]$ of generalized power series with coefficients in R and exponents in S satisfies $ACCP$ if and only if R and S satisfy $ACCP$ (see [19, Theorem 3.2]).

Frohn in [8] showed that if a ring R satisfies $ACCP$ and $R[X]$ has ACC on annihilator ideals, then $R[X]$ also satisfies $ACCP$ for commutative rings.

R. Mazurek and M. Zimbowski [22] proved that, if R is a domain and ω an endomorphism of R, then R satisfies $ACCPL$ and ω_s is injective for each $s \in S$ if and only if $R[[S, \omega]]$ is a domain and satisfies $ACCPL$; and R is an $ACCPR$-domain and ω_s is injective for every $s \in S$ and preserves nonunits of R if and only if $R[[S, \omega]]$ is an $ACCPR$-domain.

Nasr-Isfahani [23] extended Frohn's theorem to the ring $R[x; \alpha, \delta]$ with some conditions on R and α.

According to Krempa [18], an endomorphism α of a ring R is said to be *rigid* if $a\alpha(a) = 0$ implies $a = 0$, for $a \in R$. A ring R is said to be α-*rigid* if there exists a rigid endomorphism α of R. Clearly, every domain D with a monomorphism α is rigid. It is clear that, α-rigid rings are *reduced* (rings with no non-zero nilpotent elements) see e.g., [11].

A ring R is left *archimedean*, if and only if for each nonunit element $r \in R$ we have $\bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}} Rr^n = \{0\}$. Right archimedean rings are defined similarly.

It is well known that each $ACCP$-domain is archimedean. In fact, if R is a domain, then, by Z. Liu [19], for any domain R, R satisfies $ACCPL$ if and only if $\bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}} r_1 r_2 \cdots r_n R = \{0\}$ for any sequence $(r_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of nonunits of R.

In section 2, we prove that, if S is an Artinian strictly totally ordered monoid, R is an S-rigid ring satisfying $ACCPR$, and ω_s an automorphism of R for each $s \in S$, then $R[[S, \omega]]$ is an $ACCPR$ ring. Also we show that, if R is an α-rigid ring satisfying $ACCPL(R)$ and ACC on left (or right) annihilators, then the skew Laurent polynomial ring $R[x, x^{-1}; \alpha]$ satisfies $ACCPL(R)$.

In section 3, we prove that, if R is a right archimedean domain, S an Artinian strictly totally ordered monoid and ω_s is injective for any $s \in S$ and preserves nonunit elements of R, then $R[[S, \omega]]$ is a right archimedean domain. We also show that when S is an Artinian strictly totally ordered monoid, R is a left archimedean S-rigid ring that satisfies ACC on annihilators, then $R[[S, \omega]]$ is a left archimedean ring. Also, when R is a right archimedean S-rigid ring that satisfies ACC on annihilators and if ω_s preserves nonunits of R for each $s \in S$, then $R[[S, \omega]]$ is a right archimedean ring.

2 The Skew Generalized Power Series Rings Satisfying ACCPR or ACCPL

In this section, we first study the skew generalized power series ring $R[[S, \omega]]$ satisfies $ACCPL$ or $ACCPR$, and next we consider the skew Laurent polynomial ring $R[x, x^{-1}; \alpha]$, where α is a monomorphism. G. Marks et al. in [20, Theorem 4.12] proved that if $(S, \leq)$ is an a.n.u.p.-monoid, then R is S-rigid if and only if $R[[S, \omega]]$ is reduced.

The following characterization of $ACCPL$-domains [19, Lemma 3.1], is useful in the sequel.

Proposition 2.1. *For any domain R, the following are equivalent:*
(1) R satisfies ACCPL.

(2) For any sequences $(a_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, $(b_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of elements of R such that $a_n = b_n a_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $b_n \in U(R)$ for all $n \geq m$.

(3) For any sequences $(a_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, $(b_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of elements of R such that $a_n = b_n a_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $b_m \in U(R)$.

(4) $\bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}} r_1 r_2 \cdots r_n R = \{0\}$ for any sequence $(r_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of nonunits of R.

The following lemmas are very useful in our proofs in this section. Their proof are similar to what Hong et al. proved in [14, Lemma 4].

Lemma 2.2. *Let R be a S-rigid ring and $a, b \in R$. Then we have the following*

(1) If $ab = 0$, then for any $s \in S$ we have $a\omega_{s^n}(b) = \omega_{s^n}(a)b = 0$ for any positive integer n.

(2) If for some $s \in S$ and positive integer k, $a\omega_{s^k}(b) = \omega_{s^k}(a)b = 0$, then $ab = 0$.

Lemma 2.3. *Let R be an S-rigid ring. If $\omega_s(ab) = 0$ with $s \in S$, then $\omega_{ss'}(a)\omega_s(b) = 0$ for any $s' \in S$ such that $ss' = s's$.*

Proof. One can see that

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_s(b)\omega_{ss'}(a)\omega_{s'}(\omega_s(b)\omega_{ss'}(a)) =& \omega_s(b)\omega_{ss'}(a)\omega_{s'}(\omega_s(b))\omega_{s'}(\omega_{ss'}(a))\\ =& \omega_s(b)\omega_{ss'}(a)\omega_{s's}(b)\omega_{s'ss'}(a).\end{aligned}$$

Since $ss' = s's$, we have

$$\omega_s(b)\omega_{ss'}(a)\omega_{s's}(b)\omega_{s'ss'}(a) = \omega_s(b)\omega_{s's}(ab)\omega_{s'ss'}(a) = \omega_s(b)\omega_{s'}(\omega_s(ab))\omega_{s'ss'}(a) = 0.$$

Since R is S-rigid, $\omega_s(b)\omega_{ss'}(a) = 0$ so $(\omega_{ss'}(a)\omega_s(b))^2 = 0$, and $\omega_{ss'}(a)\omega_s(b) = 0$, as R is reduced. □

Recall that an ideal I of R is called α-ideal, if $\alpha(I) \subseteq I$. The ideal I is called α-invariant if $\alpha^{-1}(I) = I$. R. Mazurek and M. Zimbowski in [22] proved that, if R is a domain and ω_s is an injective endomorphism of R for each $s \in S$, then R satisfies $ACCPL$ if and only if $R[[S, \omega]]$ is a domain and satisfies $ACCPL$.

In the following result we consider the case that R is not assumed to be a domain. There are various monoids S and S-rigid rings which are not domains and satisfy $ACCPR$.

Theorem 2.4. *Let S be an Artinian strictly totally ordered monoid and ω_s be an automorphism of R, for each $s \in S$. If R is an S-rigid ring satisfying $ACCPR$, then $R[[S, \omega]]$ satisfies $ACCPR$.*

Proof. We use the method employed by Frohn [8, Theorem 4.1]. For each $f \in A = R[[S, \omega]]$ let $I_f = \{g(\pi(g))|g \in AfA\} \cup \{0\}$. It is easy to see that I_f is an ideal of R. Next assume on the contrary that there exists a non stabilizing chain of principal right ideals of A. So the set

$$M = \left\{ \mathrm{Ann}_R(\bigcup_{i\geq 1} I_{g_i}) | g_1A \subseteq g_2A \subseteq \cdots \text{is a non stabilizing chain of principal right ideals in } A \right\}$$

is nonempty. Since R is S-rigid, R is reduced. So it is easy to see that R satisfies the ACC on left annihilators. Thus M has a maximal element. Let $P = \mathrm{Ann}_R(\bigcup_{i\geq 1} I_{f_i})$ be a maximal element of M, where $f_1A \subseteq f_2A \subseteq \cdots$ is a nonstabilizing chain in A.

We show that P is a completely prime ideal of R. Assume that $a \notin P, b \notin P$ and $ab \in P$. Since R is S-rigid, using Lemma 2.3 we can see that $a \in \mathrm{Ann}_R(\bigcup_{i\geq 1} I_{bf_i})$. Also we have

$P \subseteq \mathrm{Ann}_R(\bigcup_{i\geq 1} I_{bf_i})$. So the chain $bf_1A \subseteq bf_2A \subseteq \cdots$ stabilizes. Then there exists a positive integer t such that for each $n \geq t$, $bf_{n+1} = bf_nh_n$ for some $h_n \in A$. For each positive integer n, there exists $v_n \in A$ such that $f_n = f_{n+1}v_n$. Thus for each $n \geq t$, $bf_{n+1}(1 - v_nh_n) = 0$. Let $q_i = f_i(1 - v_{i-1}h_{i-1})$, for each $i > t$. Since R is reduced, $b \in \mathrm{Ann}_R(\bigcup_{i\geq 1} Iq_i)$ and $P \subseteq_R (\bigcup_{i\geq 1} Iq_i)$. Then the chain $q_1A \subseteq q_2A \subseteq \cdots$ stabilizes. Thus there exists a positive integer t' such that for each $m \geq t'$, $q_{m+1} = q_ml_m$ for some $l_m \in A$. Then $f_{m+1}(1 - g_mh_m) = f_m(1 - g_{m-1}h_{m-1})l_m$ and so $f_{m+1} = f_ml_m + f_m(1 - g_{m-1}h_{m-1})l_m$. Thus we have a contradiction $f_{m+1} \in f_mA$. Which shows that P is a completely prime ideal of R.

Since R is S-rigid and $P = \mathrm{Ann}_R(\bigcup_{i\geq 1} I_{f_i})$, using Lemma 2.3, we claim that P is ω_s-invariant for any $s \in S$. Let $r \in \omega_s^{-1}(P)$. So $\omega_s^{-1}(p) = r$ for some $p \in P$, and so $\omega_s(r)(\bigcup_{i\geq 1}(I_{f_i})) = 0$. Thus $\omega_s(r)u = 0$ for every $u \in \bigcup_{i\geq 1} I_{f_i}$. Hence $\omega_s(ru) = \omega_s(r)\omega_s(u) = 0$, and since ω_s is injective, $ru = 0$. Thus $r \in \mathrm{Ann}_R(\bigcup_{i\geq 1} I_{f_i}) = P$ which means that $\omega_s^{-1}(P) \subseteq P$.

Now let $T = (R/P)[[S, \bar{\omega}]]$. Since R is an $ACCPR$-ring and P is a completely prime ideal of R, it follows that R/P is an $ACCPR$-domain. On the other hand ω_s is an automorphism, thus it preserves nonunit element of R for every $s \in S$. Hence T is an $ACCPR$-domain.

For each positive integer i, $\bar{f}_i = \bar{f_{i+1}}\bar{g}_i$, where $\bar{f}(s) = f(s) + P \in T$. If $\bar{f}_i = \bar{0}$ for some i, then $f_i(\pi(f_i)) \in P$. We claim that $f_i(\pi(f_i))^2 = 0$. One can see that $f_i\pi(f_i) \in P$ which means that $f_i(\pi(f_i))(\bigcup_{i\geq 1} I_{f_i}) = 0$. Thus $f_i(\pi(f_i))f(\pi(1f_i1)) = 0$ which gives $f_i(\pi(f_i))^2 = 0$. Since R is S-rigid, R is reduced and $f_i(\pi(f_i)) = 0$ which is a contradiction because $\pi(f_i) \in \mathrm{supp}(f_i)$. So for each i, $\bar{f}_i \neq \bar{0}$ and hence $\bar{g}_i \neq \bar{0}$. By [22, Proposition 2.1], there exists a positive integer j such that for each $m \geq j$, $\bar{g_m}$ is invertible in T. Then there is some $\bar{h} \in T$ such that $\bar{g_m}\bar{h} = \bar{h}\bar{g_m} = \bar{1}$. Hence $\bar{g_m}\bar{h} - \bar{1} = \bar{0}$. So it is easy to see that for each $s' \in \mathrm{supp}(b)$, we have $b(s') = (g_mh - 1)(s') \in P$. Since $b(s') \in P$, for each i, $b(s')f_i(\pi(f_i)) = 0$ which means that $b(s')f_{m+1}(\pi(f_{m+1})) = 0$ and hence $f_{m+1}\big(\pi(f_{m+1})\big)b(s') = 0$. By Lemma 2.3, we have $f_{m+1}(\pi(f_{m+1}))\omega_{\pi(f_{m+1})}(b(s')) = 0$. Now, define

$$B = \{s | s > \pi(f_{m+1}), f_{m+1}(s)\omega_s(b(s')) \neq 0\}.$$

If $B = \emptyset$, then $f_{m+1}b(s') = 0$ and so $f_{m+1}(g_mh - 1) = 0$. If $B \neq \emptyset$, B has a minimum element s'', since S is Artinian. This means that $f_{m+1}(s'')\omega_{s''}(b(s')) \neq 0$ and hence $f_{m+1}(s'')b(s') \neq 0$. On the other hand, we know that $b \in P$ and $f_{m+1}b \in Af_{m+1}A$. We have also $b(s') \in P$, so

$$b(s')\Big(\big(f_{m+1}b(s')\big)\big(\pi(f_{m+1}b(s'))\big)\Big) = b(s')\Big(f_{m+1}(s'')\omega_{s''}\big(b(s')\big)\Big) = 0.$$

Since A is reduced, $f_{m+1}(s'')\omega_{s''}(b(s'))b(s') = 0$. By Lemma 2.3, $f_{m+1}(s'')\omega_{s''}(b(s'))\omega_{s''}(b(s')) = 0$. Hence $f_{m+1}(s'')\omega_{s''}(b(s')^2) = 0$. Thus by Lemma 2.3, $f_{m+1}(s'')b^2(s') = 0$. But A is reduced, so we get $f_{m+1}(s'')b(s') = 0$ which contradicts to the definition of s''. Hence $B = \emptyset$, which yields $f_{m+1}(g_mh - 1) = 0$. So $f_{m+1} = f_{m+1}g_mh = f_mh$ and thus the chain $f_1A \subseteq f_2A \subseteq f_3A \subseteq \cdots$ will stabilize, which is a contradiction. Thus the result follows. □

The following example shows that, in Theorems 2.4, 3.1 and 3.2, the Artinian condition on the monoid S is not superfluous.

Example 2.5. Let $\mathbb{Z}_n$ be the ring of integers module n. Then $\mathbb{Z}_n$ satisfies $ACCP$ and archimedean condition and also it satisfies the ACC on right annihilators. Now consider $A = \mathbb{Z}_n[[\mathbb{Q}, id_{\mathbb{Z}}]]$. We have an ascending chain as follows:

$$\langle e_1\rangle \subsetneq \langle e_{\frac{1}{2}}\rangle \subsetneq \langle e_{\frac{1}{4}}\rangle \subsetneq \langle e_{\frac{1}{8}}\rangle \subsetneq \cdots \tag{2.1}$$

which will not be stabilized, where e_s is defined in 1.1. So $\mathbb{Z}_n[[\mathbb{Q}, id_{\mathbb{Z}}]]$ does not satisfy $ACCP$. Also one can see easily that $e_1 \in Ae_{(\frac{1}{2})^n}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence

$$\bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}} Ae_{(\frac{1}{2})^n} \neq \{0\}.$$

So A is not archimedean. Note that this example does not contradicts with [22, Theorems 3.1, 3.13], as $(S, +) = \mathbb{Q}^+ \cup \{0\}$ does not satisfy $ACCP$.

Now, consider the sequences $s_n = \frac{1}{2^n}$ and $r_n = \frac{1}{2^{n+1}}$. We have the recursive formula $s_n = r_n + s_{n+1}$. So r_n has to be unit. But the units of S is $U(S) = \{0\}$. So $r_n \notin U(S)$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus according to [22, Proposition 2.1], S does not satisfy $ACCP$. So S doesn't have the necessary condition of [22, Theorems 3.1, 3.13]. Indeed, we can not apply these Theorems for $S = \mathbb{Q}^+ \cup \{0\}$.

The following example, (See [13, Example]), shows that the S-rigid condition in 2.4 is not superfluous.

Example 2.6. Let k be a field and $A_1, A_2, \cdots$ be indeterminates over k, and set

$$S = \frac{k[A_1, A_2, \cdots]}{(\{A_n(A_n - A_{n-1}) : n \geq 2\})k[A_1, A_2, \cdots]}. \tag{2.2}$$

Denote by a_n the image of A_n in S and by R the localization of S at the ideal $(a_1, a_2, \cdots)S$. Note that S is a limit of the rings S_n where S_1 is $S_1 := k[a_1]$ and

$$S_n := S_{n-1}[a_n] = \frac{S_{n-1}[A_n]}{A_n(a_{n-1} - A_n)S_{n-1}[A_n]} \quad for \quad n \geq 2.$$

Heinzer and Lantz in [13] proved that R satisfies $ACCP$ but the ring $R[x]$, does not satisfy $ACCP$. Note that in S we have

$$a_3^2(a_1 - a_2)^2 = a_3a_2(a_1 - a_2)^2 = 0,$$

but $a_3(a_1 - a_2) \neq 0$. Thus S is not reduced and since R contains (an isomorphic copy of) S (see [13]), R is not reduced. So the S-rigid condition in 2.4 is not superfluous.

We now consider a case for which S is not positive. Let R be a ring with a monomorphism α. We denote $R[x; \alpha]$ the Ore extension whose elements are the polynomials $\Sigma_{i=0}^n r_i x^i$, $r_i \in R$, where the addition is defined as usual and the multiplication subject to the relation $xa = \alpha(a)x$ for any $a \in R$. The set $\{x^j\}_{j\geq 0}$ is easily seen to be a left Ore subset of $R[x\ ; \alpha]$, so that one can localize $R[x; \alpha]$ and form the skew Laurent polynomial ring $R[x, x^{-1}\ ; \alpha]$. Elements of $R[x, x^{-1}\ ; \alpha]$ are finite sums of elements of the form $x^{-j}rx^i$ where $r \in R$ and i and j are nonnegative integers.

Now we consider D.A. Jordan's construction of the ring $A(R, \alpha)$ (See [13], for more details). Let $A(R, \alpha)$ be the subset $\{x^{-i}rx^i \mid r \in R\ ,\ i \geq 0\}$ of the skew Laurent polynomial ring $R[x, x^{-1}; \alpha]$. For each $j \geq 0$, $x^{-i}rx^i = x^{-(i+j)}\alpha^j(r)x^{(i+j)}$. It follows that the set of all such elements forms a subring of $R[x, x^{-1}; \alpha]$ with $x^{-i}rx^i + x^{-j}rx^j = x^{-(i+j)}(\alpha^j(r) + \alpha^i(s))x^{(i+j)}$ and $(x^{-i}rx^i)(x^{-j}sx^j) = x^{-(i+j)}\alpha^j(r)\alpha^i(s)x^{(i+j)}$ for $r, s \in R$ and $i, j \geq 0$. Note that α is actually an automorphism of $A(R, \alpha)$. We have $R[x, x^{-1}; \alpha] \simeq A(R, \alpha)[x, x^{-1}; \alpha]$, by way of an isomorphism which maps $x^{-i}rx^j$ to $\alpha^{-i}(r)x^{j-i}$.

Now we examine the $ACCPL$ condition for the skew Laurent polynomial ring $R[x, x^{-1}; \alpha]$. First, we recall the following propositions which are proved in [16, 24].

Proposition 2.7. *If R is a domain and α is a monomorphism of R, then $A(R,\alpha)$ is a domain.*

Proposition 2.8. *If α is monomorphism and R is α-rigid, then $A(R,\alpha)$ is α-rigid.*

Proposition 2.9. *If R is an ACCPL(R)-ring, then $A(R,\alpha)$ is an ACCPL(R)-ring.*

Proof. Assume that

$$\langle x^{-i_1} r_1 x^{i_1}\rangle \subseteq \langle x^{-i_2} r_2 x^{i_2}\rangle \subseteq \cdots$$

is a nonstabilized chain in the ring $A(R,\alpha)$. Then, $x^{-i_l} r_l x^{i_l} = (x^{-i_{l+1}} r_{l+1} x^{i_{l+1}})(x^{-t} s x^t)$ for some $x^{-t} s x^t \in A(R,\alpha)$.

Hence $\alpha^{i_{l+1}+t}(r_l) = \alpha^{i_l+t}(r_{l+1})\alpha^{i_l+i_{l+1}}(s)$. If $s' = \alpha^{i_l+i_{l+1}}(s)$, then $r_l = \alpha^{i_l-i_{l+1}}(r_{l+1})s'$. So

$$\langle r_1\rangle \subseteq \langle \alpha^{i_1-i_2}(r_2)\rangle \subseteq \langle \alpha^{i_1-i_3}(r_3)\rangle \subseteq \cdots .$$

Since R is *ACCPL(R)*-ring, the above chain will stabilized. So $r_k = \alpha^{i_k-i_{k+1}}(r_{k+1})u$, where u is a unit. Thus $\alpha^{i_{k+1}}(r_k) = \alpha^{i_k}(r_{k+1})\alpha^{i_{k+1}}(u)$. Consider $u' := \alpha^{i_{k+1}}(u)$. It is easy to see that u' is a unit in R, so

$$x^{-i_{k+1}}(r_{k+1})x^{i_{k+1}} = \alpha^{i_{k+1}}(r_{k+1}) = \alpha^{i_k}(r_k)u' = (x^{-i_k}(r_k)x^{i_k})(x^{-i_{k+1}} u x^{i_{k+1}}).$$

So $\langle x^{-i_{k+1}} r_{k+1} x^{i_{k+1}}\rangle = \langle x^{-i_k} r_k x^{i_k}\rangle$, which implies that the chain $\langle x^{-i_1} r_1 x^{i_1}\rangle \subseteq \langle x^{-i_2} r_2 x^{i_2}\rangle \subseteq \cdots$ will stabilize. □

Lemma 2.10. *Let R be an α-rigid ring. If $\mathrm{Ann}(L_1) \subseteq \mathrm{Ann}(L_2) \subseteq \cdots$, where $L_i \subseteq A(R;\alpha)$ and $K_i = \{k | \exists t : x^{-t} k x^t \in L_i\}$, then*

$$\mathrm{Ann}(K_1) \subseteq \mathrm{Ann}(K_2) \subseteq \cdots .$$

Proof. Let $s \in \mathrm{Ann}(K_l)$. So $sk_l = 0$ for each $k_l \in K_l$, so there exists $c > 0$, such that $x^{-c} k_l x^c \in L_l$. Since $sk_l = 0$, $s\alpha^r(k_l) = 0$ for each $r \geq 0$, as R is α-rigid. So $(x^{-r} s x^r)(x^{-c} k_l x^c) = 0$. Since k_l is arbitrary in K_l, $x^{-r} s x^r \in \mathrm{Ann}(L_l)$. So $x^{-r} s x^r \in \mathrm{Ann}(L_{l+1})$, for each r. Suppose that $a \in K_{l+1}$. So there is $b > 0$ such that $x^{-b} a x^b \in L_{l+1}$. Then $(x^{-r} s x^r)(x^{-b} a x^b) = 0$ for each $r > 0$. So $x^{-r-b}\alpha^b(s)\alpha^r(a)x^{b+r} = 0$, which means that $sa = 0$. So $s \in \mathrm{Ann}(K_{l+1})$, and hence $\mathrm{Ann}(K_l) \subseteq \mathrm{Ann}(K_{l+1})$. □

Theorem 2.11. *If R is an ACCPR(L)-domain with a monomorphism α, then $R[x,x^{-1};\alpha]$ is an ACCPR(L)-domain.*

Proof. Let R be an *ACCPR(L)*-domain. Then $A := A(R,\alpha)$ is an *ACCPR(L)*-domain by Proposition 2.8. By [16, Section 2], $R[x,x^{-1};\alpha] \simeq A[x,x^{-1};\alpha]$, so it is enough to show that $A[x,x^{-1};\alpha]$ is an *ACCPR(L)*-domain. Let $f \in A[x,x^{-1};\alpha]$. Suppose that $d_+(f)$ and $d_-(f)$ denote the degree of f in positive and negetive coefficients, respectively. Suppose that $\langle f_1\rangle \subseteq \langle f_2\rangle \subseteq \cdots$ is a non-stabilized chain. So $f_i = f_{i+1}k$. Let $\theta_i = d_-(f_i)$ and $\delta_i = d_+(f_i)$. We claim that there are two cases:

(*i*): $\theta_i \leq \theta_{i+1}$.

(*ii*): $\delta_i \geq \delta_{i+1}$.

To prove it, suppose that $\delta_i < \delta_{i+1}$ and $\theta_i > \theta_{i+1}$. Let $f_i(x) = \sum_{l=\theta_i}^{\delta_i}(x^{-t_l} f_l^i x^{t_l})x^l$ and $k(x) = \sum_{j=d_-(k)}^{d_+(k)}(x^{-t_j} k_j x^{t_j})x^j$ and $f_{i+1}(x) = \sum_{h=\theta_{i+1}}^{\delta_{i+1}}(x^{-t_h} f_h^{i+1} x^{t_h})x^h$. Hence

$$x^{-t_{\delta_i}} f^i_{\delta_i} x^{t_{\delta_i}} = (x^{-t_{\delta_{i+1}}} f^{i+1}_{\delta_{i+1}} x^{t_{\delta_{i+1}}})(x^{-t_{d_+(k)}} k_{d_+(k)} x^{t_{d_+(k)}}).$$

Or we have,

$$x^{-t_{\theta_i}} f^i_{\theta_i} x^{t_{\theta_i}} = (x^{-t_{\theta_{i+1}}} f^{i+1}_{\theta_{i+1}} x^{t_{\theta_{i+1}}})(x^{-t_{d_-(k)}} k_{d_-(k)} x^{t_{d_-(k)}}).$$

So if $d_+(k) \geq 0$, then $\delta_i \geq \delta_{i+1}$, since R is domain and $f^{i+1}_{\delta_{i+1}}$, $k_{d_+(k)} \neq 0$. Similarly, if $d_-(k) < 0$, then $\theta_i \leq \theta_{i+1}$. So it contradicts to our assumption, hence one of mentioned cases occurs. Now there are three cases for the sequence $\langle f_1\rangle \subseteq \langle f_2\rangle \subseteq \cdots$.

(i): There exists a subsequence f_{i_j} such that $\langle f_{i_1}\rangle \subseteq \langle f_{i_2}\rangle \subseteq \cdots$ and $\delta_{i_j} > \delta_{i_{j-1}}$ for all j. But it is impossible unless $\delta_1 = +\infty$ which is a contradiction.

(ii): For each i we have $\delta_i = \delta_{i+1}$ and $\theta_i = \theta_{i+1}$. So if $f_{i+1}k_i = f_i$, then k_i is constant. But A is an *ACCPL(R)*-ring, so there exists N such that k_N is unit. Thus $\langle f_{N+1}\rangle = \langle f_N\rangle$.

(iii): There does not exist any subsequence such that $\delta_{i_j} > \delta_{i_{j+1}}$ for all j. So it should exist one subsequence $\{f_{i_j}\}$ such that $\theta_{i_j} < \theta i_{j-1}$, otherwise $\delta_i = \delta_{i+1}$ and $\theta_i = \theta_{i+1}$ for $i > N$ which is case (ii). This means that $\theta_1 = -\infty$ which is impossible. So the result follows □

In the following result we consider the case that R is not assumed to be a domain. Notice that rings with rigid endomorphisms are reduced.

Theorem 2.12. *Let R be an α-rigid ring and α preserves nonunits. If R is an ACCPL(R)-ring satisfying ACC on left(or right) annihilators, then $R[x, x^{-1}; \alpha]$ is an ACCPL(R)-ring.*

Proof. Let R be an *ACCPL(R)*-ring satisfying *ACC* on left(or right) annihilators. So $A := A(R, \alpha)$ is an *ACCPL(R)*-ring and satisfies the *ACC* for left(or right) annihilators by Propositions 2.9 and 2.10. Because $R[x, x^{-1}; \alpha] \simeq A[x, x^{-1}; \alpha]$, so it is enough to show that $A[x, x^{-1}; \alpha]$ is an *ACCPL(R)*-ring. We prove this for right case, the left case is similar. Let $I_f := \{a_{d_+(g)} + b_{d_-(h)} | g, h \in SfS, g = \sum a_i x^i, h = \sum b_i x^i\}$ for each $f \in A[x, x^{-1}; \alpha]$. One can show that I_f is an ideal.

Now assume that there exists a nonstabilizing chain of principal right ideals of S. So the set

$$M = \Big\{\mathrm{Ann}(\bigcup I_{g_i}) | g_1 S \subseteq g_2 S \subseteq \cdots \textit{ a nonstabilizing chain}\Big\}$$

is nonempty. Since R is α-rigid, R is reduced and so it is easy to see that since A satisfies the *ACC* on right annihilators, A satisfies the *ACC* on left annihilators. Thus M has a maximal element. Let $P = \mathrm{Ann}(\bigcup I_{f_i})$ be a maximal element of M, where $f_1 S \subseteq f_2 S \subseteq \cdots$ is a nonstabilizing chain in S. We show that P is a completely prime ideal in A. Assume $a, b \in R \setminus P$ and $ab \in P$. So $ab \in \mathrm{Ann}(\bigcup I_{f_i})$ which means that $abI_{f_i} = 0$ for each i. So for each $x^{-i}(a_{d_+(g)} + b_{d_-(h)})x^i$, $abx^{-i}(a_{d_+(g)} + b_{d_-(h)})x^i = 0$. If $a = x^{-\gamma}a'x^{\gamma}$, $b = x^{-\beta}b'x^{\beta}$, then

$$x^{-\gamma}a'x^{\gamma}(x^{-\beta}b'x^{\beta}.x^{-i}(a_{d_+(g)} + b_{d_-(h)})x^i) = 0$$

with $b'g, b'h \in SfS$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} &x^{-\gamma}a'x^{\gamma}(x^{-\beta}b'x^{\beta}.x^{-i}(a_{d_+(g)} + b_{d_-(h)})x^i) = \\ &x^{-\gamma}a'x^{\gamma}(x^{-\beta-i}\alpha^i(b')\alpha^{\beta}(a_{d_+(g)} + b_{d_-(h)})x^{\beta+i}) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since A is α-rigid, $a \in \mathrm{Ann}(I_{bf_i})$. Also the chain $bf_1S \subseteq bf_2S \subseteq \cdots$ stabilizes, because $P \subseteq \mathrm{Ann}(I_{bf_i})$. Hence there exists a positive integer t such that for each $n \geq t$, $bf_{n+1} = bf_nh_n$. Also for each n one can see that $f_n = f_{n+1}g_n$. So $bf_{n+1} = bf_{n+1}g_nh_n$. So $bf_{n+1}(1 - g_nh_n) = 0$. Let $q_i = f_i(1 - g_{i-1}h_{i-1})$, for each $i > t$. So $b \in \mathrm{Ann}(\bigcup I_{q_i})$ and also $P \subseteq \mathrm{Ann}(I_{q_i})$. So $q_1S \subseteq q_2S \subseteq \cdots$ stabilizes. Thus there exists a positive integer t' such that for each $m \geq t'$, $q_{m+1} = q_ml_m$ for some $l_m \in S$. Then $f_{m+1}(1 - g_mh_m) = f_m(1 - g_{m-1}h_{m-1})l_m$ and so $f_{m+1} \in f_mS$, which is a contradiction. So P is completely prime.

We show that P is α-invariant. Let $a \in \alpha^{-1}(P)$. So $\alpha(a) \in P$. Hence $\alpha(a)I_{f_i} = 0$ for each i. But, since A is α-rigid, $aI_{f_i} = 0$ for each i. So $a \in P$ and that $\alpha^{-1}(P) \subseteq P$.

Let $a \in P$. So $aI_{f_i} = 0$ for each i. Hence $\alpha^{-1}(a)I_{f_i} = 0$, as R is α-rigid and α is an automorphism of A. So $\alpha^{-1}(P) = P$ and P is α-invariant. Thus $T := R/P[x, x^{-1}; \overline{\alpha}]$ is an *ACCPL(R)*-domain. We know that for each i, $\bar{f}_i = \overline{f_{i+1}}\bar{g}_i$ with

$$\bar{f}_i = \sum_{t=\theta_i}^{\delta_i} (a_t + P)x^t.$$

If $\bar{f}_i = \bar{0}$ for some i, then $a_{\delta_i} \in P$. So $a_{\delta_i}I_{f_i} = 0$. Thus $a_{\delta_i}\alpha^{\delta_i}(a_{\delta_i}) = 0$ which means that $a_{\delta_i} = 0$, since A is α-rigid. So $\bar{f}_i \neq \bar{0}$ and so $\bar{g}_i \neq \bar{0}$. Since T is an *ACCPR(L)*-ring, $\bar{g}_i$ must be a unit where $i > m$ for some $m > 0$. So $\bar{g}_i\bar{h} = \bar{h}\bar{g}_i = \bar{1}$. So for each coefficient b of the polynomial $g_mh - 1$, we claim that $b \in P$. We claim that $f_{m+1}(g_mh - 1) = 0$. Assume that

$$f_{m+1} = \sum_{t=\theta_{m+1}}^{\delta_{m+1}} (a_t)x^t.$$

So $a_{\delta_{m+1}}, a_{\theta_{m+1}} \in I_{f_{m+1}}$. Since $b \in P$, $ba_{\delta_{m+1}} = 0, ba_{\theta_{m+1}} = 0$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} f_{m+1}b &= \sum_{t=\theta_{m+1}}^{\delta_{m+1}} (a_t)x^tb \\ &= a_{\theta_{m+1}}\alpha^{\theta_{m+1}}(b)x^{\theta_{m+1}} + \cdots + a_{\delta_{m+1}}\alpha^{\delta_{m+1}}(b)x^{\delta_{m+1}} \\ &= \sum_{t=\theta_{m+1}+1}^{\delta_{m+1}-1} (a_t)x^tb. \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

But $f_{m+1}b \in SfS$, so $a_{\theta_{m+1}+1}, a_{\delta_{m+1}-1} \in I_{f_{m+1}}$. So $ba_{\theta_{m+1}+1} = ba_{\delta_{m+1}-1} = 0$. Hence inductively we have $f_{m+1}b = 0$. So $f_{m+1}(g_mh_m - 1) = 0$, and $f_{m+1} = f_{m+1}g_mh = f_mh$. So $\langle f_1\rangle \subseteq \langle f_2\rangle \subseteq \cdots$ stabilizes, which contradicts our assumption and the result follows. □

Example 2.13. Let k be a field and $R = \frac{k\langle x_1, x_2, \cdots\rangle}{\langle x_1x_2, x_1x_3, \cdots\rangle}$. The ring R does not satisfy the *ACC* on annihilators, as $\mathrm{Ann}(x_1, x_2, \cdots) \subseteq \mathrm{Ann}(x_2, x_3, \cdots) \subseteq \mathrm{Ann}(x_3, x_4, \cdots) \subseteq \cdots$. Also we claim that R is an *ACCP*-ring. To do this, first, notice that if $f, g \in R$ and $f_0, g_0 \neq 0$, then $deg_{x_i}(fg) \geq max(deg_{x_i}(f), deg_{x_i}(g))$. Moreover, if $f_0 = 0$ and $deg_{x_i}(g) > 0$, then $deg_{x_i}(fg) = 0$ or $deg_{x_i}(fg) > deg_{x_i}(g)$ and $(fg)_0 = 0$. The case $deg_{x_i}(fg) > deg_{x_i}(g)$ occurs if and only if $deg_{x_i}(f), deg_{x_i}(g) > 0$.

Now let $\langle f_1\rangle \subseteq \langle f_2\rangle \subseteq \cdots$. So $f_n = g_nf_{n+1}$. If $g_{n,0} \neq 0$, $f_{n+1,0} \neq 0$ then $deg_{x_i}(g) \geq deg_{x_i}(f_{n+1})$ for each i. So g_n must be a unit for each n and since k is a field, so the mentioned chain will stabilize.

Let $f_{1,0}=0$. Then $deg_{x_i}(f_1g)\geq deg_{x_i}(f_1)$, when $deg_{x_i}(f_1)>0$; and $deg_{x_i}(f_1g)=0$, otherwise. So one can see inductively that $deg_{x_i}(f_n)\leq deg_{x_i}(f_1)$ if $deg_{x_i}(f_1)>0$ and $deg_{x_i}(f_n)=0$, otherwise. Hence $deg_{x_i}(f_n)=deg_{x_i}(f_m)$ for each x_i if $deg_{x_i}(f_1)>0$ for infinitely many m,n (otherwise $deg_{x_i}(f_1)=\infty$ which is impossible). Let $\langle f_{n_1}\rangle\subseteq\langle f_{n_2}\rangle\subseteq\cdots$ be the mentioned chain such that $deg_{x_i}(f_{n_i})=deg_{x_i}(f_{n_{i+1}})$. So the chain stabilized by the fact that k is a field. So the chain $\langle f_1\rangle\subseteq\langle f_2\rangle\subseteq\cdots$ will stabilize and R is an $ACCP$-ring.

Also, we claim that R is reduced. Let $f\in R$ such that $f^2=0$. Let $deg_{x_i}(f)>0$. It is easy to see that $deg_{x_i}(f^2)=2deg_{x_i}(f)>0$ which is impossible. So R is reduced.

Now, we claim that $R[t]$ is not an $ACCP$-ring. Let $f_n=(\sum_{i=n}^{\infty}x_i)t+(1+\sum_{i=n}^{\infty}x_i)$ and $g_n(t)=x_{n-1}t+(1+x_{n-1})$. It is obvious that $f_ng_n=f_{n-1}$. So $\langle f_1\rangle\subseteq\langle f_2\rangle\subseteq\cdots$. Also it is easy to see that for each $n\geq 1$, $g_n\notin U(R)$. Otherwise, let $g_n\in U(R)$ for some $n\geq 1$. So $g_nh=1$ for some $h\in R$. So $(x_{n-1}t+(1+x_{n-1}))h=1$, and $h_0=1+\sum_{j\neq n-1}a_jx_j$. So $h_0x_{n-1}+(1+x_{n-1})h_1=0$, and

$$x_{n-1}+h_1+x_{n-1}h_1=0. \tag{2.4}$$

Hence $h_{1,0}=0$. If $deg_{x_{n-1}}(h_1)=0$, then left side of 2.4 has a nonzero coefficient of x_{n-1}, but the right side does not. Else if, $deg_{x_{n-1}}(h_1)>0$, then $deg_{x_{n-1}}(x_{n-1}h_1)>max(deg_{x_{n-1}}(h_1),1)$. But $x_{n-1}h_1=-h_1-x_{n-1}$, which means that $deg_{x_{n-1}}(-h_1-x_{n-1})=deg_{x_{n-1}}(x_{n-1}h_1)$, which contradicts $deg_{x_{n-1}}(x_{n-1}h_1)>max(deg_{x_{n-1}}(h_1),1)$. So $R[t]$ is not an $ACCP$-ring. So the condition ACC on annihilators can not be omitted.

3 Archimedean Skew Generalized Power Series Rings

A domain R is said to be archimedean if $\cap_{n\geq 1}a^nR=0$ for each nonunit a of R. It is well-known that any domain satisfying $ACCP$ is archimedean, but the converse is not true (see, for example, Dumitrescu et al., [5], p. 1127). We consider this property for skew generalized power series ring. First, recall that if $(S,.,\leq)$ is a strictly totally ordered monoid and $0\neq f\in R[[S,\omega]]$, then $\mathrm{supp}(f)$ is a nonempty well-ordered subset of S. The smallest element of $\mathrm{supp}(f)$ is denoted by $\pi(f)$. R. Mazurek and M. Ziembowski in [21, Proposition 3.2] proved that if $s\in U(S)$ and $f(s)\in U(R)$, then $f\in U(R[[S,\omega]])$.

Theorem 3.1. *Let R be a right archimedean domain and S an Artinian strictly totally ordered monoid. If ω_s is injective for each $s\in S$ and it preserves nonunit elements of R, then $R[[S,\omega]]$ is a right archimedean domain.*

Proof. Set $A=R[[S,\omega]]$. It is clear that A is a domain. Assume to the contrary that f is a nonunit element of A. So there is a nonzero element g in $\bigcap_{n\geq 1}Af^n$. Then for each $n\in\mathbb{N}$ there exists $h_n\in A$ such that $g=h_nf^n$. Using [22, Proposition 3.1(i)], we get $\pi(g)=\pi(h_nf^n)$ and so $\pi(g)=\pi(h_n)\pi(f^n)$. So $g(\pi(g))=h_n(\pi(h_n))\omega_{\pi(h_n)}(f^n(\pi(f^n)))$. There are two cases.

First, let $\mathrm{supp}(f)=\{1\}$, then $\pi(h_n)=\pi(g)$. So $g(\pi(g))=h_n(\pi(h_n))\omega_{\pi(g)}(f^n(\pi(f^n)))$. Also $f^n(\pi(f^n))=(f(\pi(f)))^n$, since R is a domain. So for each $n\in\mathbb{N}$,

$$g(\pi(g))=h_n(\pi(h_n))\left(\omega_{\pi(g)}(f(\pi(f)))\right)^n\in R\left(\omega_{\pi(g)}(f(\pi(f)))\right)^n.$$

This yields that $g(\pi(g))\in\bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}}R\left(\omega_{\pi(g)}(f(\pi(f)))\right)^n$. Also $f(\pi(f))$ is not a unit, since otherwise $\pi(f)$ and $f(\pi(f))$ would be both units and f will be unit, by [22, Proposition 3.1(i)].

Since R is right archimedean, as $g(\pi(g))=0$, which contradicts the fact that $\pi(g)\in\mathrm{supp}(g)$. Thus $g=0$ and the result follows.

Now suppose that $\text{supp}(f) \neq \{1\}$. There are three cases.

Case 1. $\pi(f) > 1$. We know that $\pi(g) = \pi(h_n)\pi(f)^n$. So $\pi(h_n) < \pi(h_{n-1})$ for each n. Thus $\{\pi(h_n)\}$ forms a descending chain and must have a maximal element which is a contradiction.

Case 2. $\pi(f) < 1$. Which means that $\{\pi(f^n)\}$ forms a descending chain and has a maximal element. This is also a contradiction.

Case 3. $\pi(f) = 1$. So $f(\pi(f))$ is not a unit since otherwise f would be a unit. Also one can see that

$$(h_1 f)(1) = (h_2 f)(1) = \cdots$$

So $h_1 f = 0$, since R is archimedean. So $h_i f^i = 0$ for all i which contradicts our assumption. □

This result can be applied even when the endomorphisms ω_s are rigid monomorphisms. In fact, we proved the above theorem for S-rigid ring R as follows.

Theorem 3.2. *Let S be an Artinian strictly totally ordered monoid and let R be a right archimedean and S-rigid ring. Assume that R satisfies the ACC on annihilators and that ω_s preserves nonunits of R for each $s \in S$. Then $R[[S, \omega]]$ is a right archimedean reduced ring.*

Proof. Assume to the contrary that $A = R[[S, \omega]]$ is not a right archimedean ring. Then there exists $g \in A$ such that $\bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}} Ag^n \neq \{0\}$. Also consider $I_f = \{g(\pi(g))|g \in AfA\}$ for $f \in A$ as in Theorem 3.1. There are two cases for g:

Case 1. $\text{Ann}(\bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} I_{a_i}) = 0$ for all $a_i \in A$ such that

$$0 \neq a_1 g = a_2 g^2 = \cdots = a_n g^n = \cdots .$$

So for each i, one can see that

$$\pi(a_i g^i) = \pi(a_i)\pi(g^i) = \pi(a_i)\pi(g)^i.$$

Note that since R is S-rigid, A is reduced by ([20],[8]) and $\pi(g^i) = \pi(g)^i$. Now, there are three cases:

(i): $\pi(g) < 1$. Then we have

$$1 > \pi(g) > \pi(g^2) \cdots$$

which should be stabilized and it is a contradiction.

(ii): $\pi(g) > 1$. Then, since $\pi(a_i)\pi(g^i) = \pi(a_{i+1})\pi(g^{i+1})$, we have

$$\pi(a_1) > \pi(a_2) > \cdots .$$

Since S is Artinian, $\pi(a_i) = \pi(a_{i+1})$ for some i. But this contradicts $\pi(g) > 1$.

(iii): $\pi(g) = 1$, Then $g(\pi(g))$ is not a unit as g is not a unit. So

$$a_i(\pi(a_i))g^i(\pi(g^i)) = a_{i+1}(\pi(a_{i+1}))g^{i+1}(\pi(g^{i+1})) \quad for \quad i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

So $a_1(\pi(a_1))g(\pi(g)) \in Rg^i(\pi(g^i))$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and since R is S-rigid and hence reduced, we have $a_1(\pi(a_1))g(\pi(g)) \in R(g(\pi(g)))^i$. Also, R is archimedean, and $a_1(\pi(a_1))g(\pi(g)) \in \bigcap_{i\in\mathbb{N}} R(g(\pi(g)))^i$, so $a_1(\pi(a_1))g(\pi(g)) = 0$. So

$$0 = a_1(\pi(a_1))g(\pi(g)) = a_2(\pi(a_2))\left(g(\pi(g))\right)^2 = \cdots .$$

It is easy to show that $a_i(\pi(a_i))g(\pi(g)) = 0$ because of the fact that R is reduced. So for all i, $g(\pi(g)) \in \text{Ann}\,(a_i(\pi(a_i)))$. So

$$g(\pi(g)) \in \text{Ann}\left(\bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} I_{a_i}\right) = \{0\}.$$

Hence $g(\pi(g)) = 0$ which is a contradiction.

Case 2. Let $\text{Ann}\left(\bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} I_{a_i}\right) \neq \{0\}$ such that

$$0 \neq a_1 g = a_2 g^2 = \cdots = a_k g^k = \cdots .$$

Define

$$T = \{\text{Ann}\,(\bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} I_{b_i g})\,|\,\text{Ann}\,(\bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} I_{b_i g}) \neq 0, \quad 0 \neq b_1 g = \cdots = b_2 g^2 = \cdots\}.$$

We know that $T \neq \emptyset$ and R satisfies ACC on annihilators. So T has a maximal element like $\text{Ann}\left(\bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} I_{a_i f}\right)$ for some $f \in A$ such that

$$0 \neq a_1 f = a_2 f^2 = \cdots = a_n f^n = \cdots . \tag{3.1}$$

We claim that $V := \text{Ann}\left(\bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} I_{a_i f}\right)$ is a completely prime ideal of A. Since R is S-rigid, V is a two sided ideal. Let $ab \in V$ and a, b are not in V. Then

$$ab(a_i f)(\pi(a_i f)) = 0 \quad for \quad all \quad i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

So $a \in \text{Ann}(I_{ba_i f})$. But it is easy to see that

$$V \subseteq \text{Ann}(I_{ba_i f}). \tag{3.2}$$

Since $b \notin V$, we can see that $\text{Ann}(I_{ba_i f}) \neq \{0\}$. Also by multiplying b to equation (3.1), we have

$$0 \neq ba_1 f = ba_2 f^2 = \cdots \quad .$$

So $\text{Ann}(I_{ba_i f}) \in T$. Also V is maximal in T. This and 3.2 yields that $V = \text{Ann}(I_{ba_i f})$, which implies that $a \in V$ which is a contradiction. So V is a two sided completely prime ideal.

Now we show that ω_s is V-invariant for each $s \in S$. Let $r \in V$. Then $rI_{a_i} = 0$ by Lemma 2.3. So $V \subseteq \omega_s(V)$ for each $s \in S$. Now let $r \in \omega_s(V)$, so $r \in \omega_s(t)$ such that $t \in V$ and $tI_{a_i} = 0$. So $\omega_s(tI_{a_i}) = 0$ which means that $r\omega_s(I_{a_i f}) = \omega_s(t)\omega_s(I_{a_i f})$. So $r \in \text{Ann}(\omega_s(I_{a_i f}))$. But we have $V \subseteq \omega_s(V)$ which means that

$$\text{Ann}(I_{a_i f}) \subseteq \omega_s\left(\text{Ann}(I_{a_i f})\right) = \text{Ann}\left(\omega_s(I_{a_i f})\right).$$

So $r \in \text{Ann}(I_{a_i f}) = V$. Hence $\omega_s^{-1}(V) = V$ and ω_s is V-variant for each $s \in S$.

We know that V is a completely prime ideal and hence the factor ring $U := \frac{R}{V}$ is an archimedean domain and by Theorem 3.1, $U[[S, \overline{\omega}]]$ is an archimedean domain.

We know that there exists $a_i \in A$ such that $a_1 f = a_2 f^2 = \cdots$. Hence $\overline{a_1}\overline{f} = \overline{a_2}\overline{f^2} = \cdots$. We claim that $\overline{f}$ is nonunit in $W = U[[S, \overline{\omega}]]$. Otherwise, let $\overline{f}$ be a unit. So there exists $g \in A$ such that $\overline{f}\overline{g} - \overline{1} = \overline{0}$; which means that

$$(fg - 1)(\pi(fg - 1))a_i f(\pi(a_i f)) = 0 \quad for \quad all \quad i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We have four cases.

(i): $\pi(fg-1)=1_S$ and $(fg-1)(1)=-1_R$. Hence $\pi(f)\neq 1$ or $\pi(g)\neq 1$ which means $\overline{f}$ or $\overline{g}$ are not unit since S is Artinian strictly totally ordered monoid, and the only unit of S is 1. So it is a contradiction.

(ii): $\pi(fg)<1$. So

$$1>\pi(fg)>\pi(fg)^2>\cdots$$

which contradicts to the fact that S is Artinian.

(iii): $\pi(fg-1)\neq 1$. So $fg=1+k$ for some $k\in W\backslash U$ and $\pi(k)>1$. So $f(\pi(f))\omega_{\pi(f)}\left(g(\pi(g))\right)=1$. Thus $f(\pi(f))$ is a unit and $\pi(f)=1$. This means that f is a unit and it contradicts to the definition of f.

(iv): Suppose that $fg(1)=r\neq 1$ and $\pi(fg)=1$ (i.e. $r\neq 0$). We know that $\overline{f}$ is a unit. Then $\overline{1}\in W\overline{f}^n$. So there exist $b_i\in A$, $l_i\in V$ such that

$$1+l_0=b_1f+l_1=b_2f^2+l_2=\cdots. \tag{3.3}$$

By multiplying $(a_1f)(\pi(a_1f))$, it yields that

$$(a_1f)(\pi(a_1f))=(a_1f)(\pi(a_1f))b_1f=(a_1f)(\pi(a_1f))b_2f^2=\cdots.$$

If $(a_1f)(\pi(a_1f))b_i(1)=t_i$ and $f(1)=r$, then $t_ir^i=0$ for some i. Hence $(t_ir)^i=0$ and since R is reduced, $t_ir=0$. So $(a_1f)(\pi(a_1f))b_i(1)f(1)=0$. So $\overline{b_i}(1)\overline{f}(1)=\overline{0}$ which means that $\overline{f}(1)=\overline{0}$ or $\overline{b_i}(1)=\overline{0}$. If $\overline{b_i}(1)=\overline{0}$, then $\overline{b_i}$ is not a unit which is impossible (We know that $\overline{b_if}^i=\overline{b_{i-1}f}^{i-1}$ by equation 3.3, so $\overline{b_if}^{i-1}=\overline{b_1}=\overline{1}$ which means that $\overline{b_i}$ is a unit). So $\overline{f}(1)=\overline{0}$ which is impossible according to our assumption, $\overline{f}$ that is a unit.

So for each i, $t_ir^{i+1}\neq 0$ which means that $t_ir^{i+1}=t_{i+1}r^{i+2}$. Since R is archimedean, $\bigcap_i t_ir^{i+1}=0$ which contradicts to the fact that $\overline{b_i}$ is a unit for each i.

So $\overline{f}$ is a nonunit. We have $\overline{a_1}\overline{f}=\overline{a_2}\overline{f^2}=\cdots$. Since W is archimedean, $\overline{a_1}\overline{f}=\overline{0}$. If $\overline{a_1}=\overline{0}$, then $\overline{a_1}(s)=\overline{0}$ for every $s\in S$. So $a_1(s)(a_1f)(\pi(a_1f))=0$ for every $s\in S$. Also $\omega_t\left(a_1(s)(a_1f)\right)(\pi(a_1f))=0$ for $s,t\in S$. Hence, by Lemma 2.3,

$$\begin{aligned}((a_1f)(\pi(a_1f)))\omega_{\pi(a_1f)}\left((a_1f)(\pi(a_1f))\right)&=(a_1f)^2((\pi(a_1f))^2)\\&=(a_1f)(\pi(a_1f))\omega_{\pi(a_1f)}\left(\sum_{xt=\pi(a_1f)}a_1(x)\omega_x(f(t))\right)\\&=\sum_{xt=\pi(a_1f)}\left((a_1f)(\pi(a_1f))\omega_{\pi(a_1f)}\left(a_1(x)\omega_x(f(t))\right)\right)=\sum_{xt=\pi(a_1f)}0=0.\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

So $\left((a_1f)(\pi(a_1f))\right)\omega_{\pi(a_1f)}\left((a_1f)(\pi(a_1f))\right)=0$ which yields $\left((a_1f)(\pi(a_1f))\right)^2=0$ by Lemma 2.3. Thus $(a_1f)(\pi(a_1f))=0$ which is a contradiction. The case $\overline{f}=\overline{0}$ is impossible, similarly. This completes the proof. □

We provide an example of an archimeadean $ACCP$-ring R with a homomorphism α which is not rigid, but $A=R[x;\alpha]$ is not an $ACCPL$-ring. Note that, an element $r=v_{i_1}v_{i_2}\cdots v_{i_k}$ is considered as a monomial with degree k. The degree of $s=r_1+r_2+\cdots$ is $\max_{i\in\mathbb{N}}\mathit{degree}(r_i)$.

Example 3.3. Suppose that k is a field and consider the ring R as follows:

$$R = \{k + v_1k + v_2k + \cdots + v_1v_2k + v_1v_3k + \cdots | v_i^2 = 0, \quad v_iv_j = v_jv_i \quad \textit{for every } i,j\}. \tag{3.5}$$

In fact, R also can be defined as follows

$$R = \frac{k[x_1, x_2, \cdots]}{(x_1^2, x_2^2, \cdots)k[x_1, x_2, \cdots]}. \tag{3.6}$$

Define α on R given by

$$\alpha(v_i) = \begin{cases} v_{i+1} & ; i \quad \textit{a positive even number;} \\ 0 & ; i \quad \textit{is odd.} \end{cases} \tag{3.7}$$

It is obvious that $\alpha(1) = 1$. We claim that R satisfies $ACCP$.

Now suppose that R does not satisfy $ACCP$. So there exists a non-stabilized chain:

$$a_1R \subseteq a_2R \subseteq \cdots, \quad \textit{with} \quad a_i \in R.$$

One can see easily that $degree(a_i) > degree(a_{i+1})$. So $degree(a_1) = \infty$ which is a contradiction. So R is an $ACCP$-ring. Also we claim that R is left archimeadean. Let there exists $a \in R$ such that

$$\bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}} Ra^n \neq \{0\}.$$

Then there is $t \in Ra^n$ for each n which means that the degree of t should be ∞ and it is also a contradiction. So R is left archimeadean.

The homomorphism α is not rigid because $v_3\alpha(v_3) = 0$, but $v_3 \neq 0$.

We claim that $A = R[x; \alpha]$ is not an $ACCPL$-ring. To do this, consider the following sequence:

$$f_0 = a_0x + b_0 \quad , \quad f_n = a_nx + b_n,$$

where

$$a_0 = v_1 + v_3 + \cdots \quad , \quad b_0 = 1 + v_2 + v_4 + \cdots$$

and

$$a_n = (p_0)^{-1}\left(a_{n-1} - p_1\alpha((p_0)^{-1})\alpha(b_{n-1})\right)$$

such that

$$p_0 = 1 + v_1 \quad \textit{and} \quad p_1 = v_1 + v_3 + \cdots.$$

One can see that

$$f_{n-1} = (p_1x + p_0)f_n.$$

So we get the following chain:

$$Rf_0 \subseteq Rf_1 \subseteq \cdots. \tag{3.8}$$

Note that p_1 is not nilpotent. Since degree of p^k is k, so $p_1x + p_0$ is not a unit and we get

$$Rf_0 \subsetneq Rf_1 \subsetneq \cdots,$$

which shows that A does not satisfies $ACCPL$.

References

[1] D.D. Anderson, D.F. Anderson, M. Zafrullah, Factorization in integral domains, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **69** (1990), 1-19.

[2] D.D. Anderson, D.F. Anderson, M. Zafrullah, Factorization in integral domains II, *J. Algebra* **152** (1992), 78-93.

[3] H. Bass, Finitistic dimension and a homological generalization of semi-primary rings, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **95** (1960), 466-488.

[4] P.M. Cohn, Free Rings and Their Relations, second ed., *Academic Press*, London, (1985).

[5] T. Dumitrescu, S.O.I. Al-Salihi, N. Radu, T. Shah, Some factorization properties of composite domains A + X B[X] and A + X B[X], *Comm. Algebra* **28** (2000), 1125-1139.

[6] G.A. Elliott, P. Ribenboim, Fields of generalized power series, *Arch. Math.* **54** (1990), 365-371.

[7] D. Frohn, A counterexample concerning ACCP in power series rings, *Comm. Algebra*, **30** (2002), 2961-2966.

[8] D. Frohn, Modules with n-ACC and the ACC on certain types of annihilators, *J. Algebra*, **256** (2002), 467-483.

[9] D. Frohn, ACCP rises to the polynomial ring if the ring has only finitely many associated primes, *Comm. Algebra* **32** (2004), 1213-1218.

[10] A. Grams, Atomic domains and the ascending chain condition for principal ideals, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **75** (1974), 321-329.

[11] E. Hashemi and A. Moussavi, Polynomial extensions of quasi-Baer rings, *Acta Math. Hungar.* **107**(3) (2005), 207-224.

[12] W. Heinzer, D. Lantz, Commutative rings with ACC on n-generated ideals, *J. Algebra* **80** (1983), 261-278.

[13] W. Heinzer and D. Lantz, ACCP in polynomial rings: a counterexample, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **121** (1994), 975-977.

[14] C.Y. Hong, N.K. Kim and T. Kwak, Ore extensions of Baer and p.p.-rings, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, **151** (2000), 215-226.

[15] D. Jonah, Rings with the minimum condition for principal right ideals have the maximum condition for principal left ideals, *Math. Z.* **113** (1970), 106-112.

[16] D.A. Jordan, Bijective extensions of injective ring endomorphisms, *J.London Math. Soc.* **2.3** (1982), 435-448.

[17] H. Kim, Factorization in monoid domains, *Comm. Algebra* **29** (2001), 1853-1869.

[18] J. Krempa, Some examples of reduced rings, *Algebra Colloq.* **3**(4) (1996), 289-300.

[19] Z. Liu, The ascending chain condition for principal ideals of rings of generalized power series, *Comm. Algebra* **32** (2004), 3305-3314.

[20] G. Marks, R. Mazurek, M. Ziembowski, A Unified Approach to Various Generalizations of Armendariz Rings, *Bull. Aust. Math. Soc.* **81** (2010), 361-397.

[21] R. Mazurek, M. Ziembowski, On von Neumann regular rings of skew generalized power series, *Comm. Algebra* **36** (2008), 1855-1868.

[22] R. Mazurek and M. Ziembowski, The ascending chain condition for principal left or right ideals of skew generalized power series rings, *J. Algebra*, **322** (2009), 983-994.

[23] A.R. Nasr-Isfahani, The ascending chain condition for principal left ideals of skew polynomial rings, *Taiwanese Journal of Mathematics*, **18**, 3 (2014), 931-941.

[24] A. R. Nasr-Isfahani, and A. Moussavi, On weakly rigid rings, *Glasgow Mathematical Journal* **51**, 03 (2009), 425-440.

[25] P. Ribenboim, Noetherian rings of generalized power series, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **79**(3) (1992), 293-312.

[26] P. Ribenboim, Special properties of generalized power series, *J. Algebra* **173** (1995a), 566-586.

[27] P. Ribenboim, Some examples of valued fields, *J. Algebra* **173** (1995b), 668-678.

[28] P. Ribenboim, Semisimple rings and von Neumann regular rings of generalized power series, *J. Algebra* **198** (1997), 327-338.

[29] K. Varadarajan, Noetherian generalized power series rings and modules. *Comm. Algebra* **29**(1) (2001), 245-251.